

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, and 4 - 8 remain in the application. Claims 3 and 16 have been canceled. Claims 9-15 and 17- 25 have been withdrawn.

In view of the Examiner's earlier restriction requirement, Applicant retains the right to present claims 9-15 and 17-25 in a divisional application.

Claims 1-3, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasimoto et al. (US 6,204,908 B1) in view of Kozaki (US 5,742,367).

Claim 1 has been changed by including the description "will illuminate the light-receiving active surface." to "will illuminate a substantially uniform dark-colored light-receiving active surface of a solar cell", which essentially incorporates descriptions from claim 3 into claim 1.

Claim 1

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of amended claim 1 for the following reasons.

1. Hashimoto et al. teaches an anisotropic light scattering layer 70. As is known, this layer reduces the total amount of light energy passing through to the layers behind, and thus would not be desirable for combination with a device having a photo-cell for recovering incident light energy, and thus teaches away from combining Hashimoto et al. with Kozaki.
2. The examiner states that "Kozaki discloses a device wherein light passing from the front side and through the backside of the liquid crystal display will illuminate the light-receiving active surface ..., wherein the light-receiving active surface is substantially black colored (col. 3, lines 7-11). The applicants do not see a description in Kozaki, col. 3, lines 7-11 or anywhere else, that the light-receiving active surface is substantially black.

For these reasons, the applicants believe that amended claim 1 is patentable over Hashimoto et al., Kozaki, and the cited art, either singly or in any combination.

Claims 2 and 7

The applicants believe that claims 2 and 7 are patentable inasmuch as they are dependent upon amended claim 1.

Claim 8

The applicants believe that claim 8 is patentable inasmuch as it is dependent upon amended claim 1. Notwithstanding this belief, the applicants believe that claim 8 is patentable on its own merits. The examiner states (Page 3, lines 7 -13) "Hashimoto et al. discloses ... wherein the device further comprising solar cells [that] has a light receiving inactive surface ... that has a different color than the substantially uniform dark-color light receiving active surface, wherein the device further comprises a mask having apertures that substantially conform topographically to the light-receiving active surfaces of the solar cell and mask surface that substantially conform to at least some of the light-receiving inactive surface and have a color that substantially matches the substantially uniform dark-color light receiving active surface of the solar cell". The examiner did not explain how and where this is described by Hasimoto et al. The applicants have not found such a description in Hashimoto et al.

The examiner makes the same statement (Page 3, line 17 to page 4, line 1) about Kozaki. The examiner makes earlier references to Kozaki, col. 3 lines 7-11 and lines 7-8, but the applicants do not find in those lines such a description, nor elsewhere within Kozaki.

For these reasons, the applicants believe that claim 8 is patentable on its own merits.

Claims 4-6 were rejected under U.S.C. 35 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasimoto et al. and Kozaki in view of Vogeley et al. (US 5,404,185)

The applicants believe that claims 4-6 are patentable inasmuch as they depend upon amended claim 1.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

Dec-20-2005 07:31pm From-MOTOROLA
Appl. No. 10/001,495
Amdt. Dated
Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2005

18475763750

T-148 P.010/010 F-846

Docket No.
Customer No., 22917


In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917

By: 

James A. Lamb
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 38,529

Telephone: 847-576-5054
Fax No.: 847-576-3750